


C. APPLICANT'S COMMENTS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this Application, with Claims 9, 10 being amended. No new matter is added by way of these amendments, and the amendments are supported throughout the Specification and the drawings. Reconsideration of Claims 1-12 is respectfully requested. The Examiner's rejections will be considered in the order of their occurrence in the Office Action.

Paragraph 1 of the Office Action

The Office Action rejected Claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Przilas et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,907,473). The Office Action stated that “*Przilas et al discloses a spray cooler for electronics that ‘continually distributes’ (last line of column 4) a dielectric cooling fluid (fluorinert) in relation to temperature sensor 116.*” (Office Action, Page 2.)

The Applicant admits that Przilas teaches a spray cooled enclosure. However, Przilas simply does not teach a system that monitors the temperature of an electronic device. As shown in Figure 3A of Przilas (shown below), the “temperature sensor 116” simply measures the air “temperature within the closed compartment 22.” (Column 6, Lines 56-59.) Przilas is not measuring the temperature of the electronic device being thermally managed (or even the coolant). Even if Przilas did teach measuring the temperature of the electronic device (which it does not), there simply is no support in Przilas that the temperature sensor is utilized to control the coolant flow in any manner – much less controlling the spray characteristics of the liquid coolant.




Paragraph 3 of the Office Action

The Official Action rejected Claims 1-9, 11 and 12 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,880,350. The Applicant has included with this response a Terminal Disclaimer executed by the attorney for the Applicant.

D. CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited. Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully asked that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. Alternatively should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, they are invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael S. Neustel (Reg. No. 41,221)
NEUSTEL LAW OFFICES, Ltd.
2534 South University Drive, Suite No. 4
Fargo, North Dakota 58103

October 7, 2005

Date

Telephone: (701) 281-8822
Facsimile: (701) 237-0544
e-mail: Michael@neustel.com